DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 737 CG 009 803

AUTHOR Veroff, Joseph
TITLE Varieties of Achievement Motivation.
PUB DATE Feb 75
NOTE 14p.; Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D.C., March 30-April 3, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; *Cognitive Processes; Factor Analysis; *Motivation; Research Projects; *Sex Differences; *Socialization; Speeches; *Success Factors

ABSTRACT

This speech addressed itself to the variety of achievement motivations that can be critically different for men and women. The author, impressed by the different ways people cognitively define and experience a successful accomplishment, developed a taxonomy of psychological cues which people might use in defining their success. Six varieties of achievement motivation were reviewed: (1) autonomous achievement; (2) power achievement, (3) socially-oriented achievement, (4) competitive achievement, (5) competence achievement, and (6) task achievement. The author hypothesized, on the basis of studies on the subject of achievement motivation, that females in American society have been taught to emphasize the process involved in their striving for achievement, while men emphasize the impact of their achievement strivings. (Author/PC)

ED106737

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

February 1975

Varieties of Achievement Motivation

by

Joseph Veroff

University of Michigan

We have come a long way in the scientific study of achievement motivation since McClelland and his co-workers introduced the systematic study of the achievement motive through projective testing. The idea of measuring and perhaps manipulating something called achievement motivation fit well with the political tenor of the 50's and 60's. If came to be thought of, despite disclaimers of researchers, as the achievement motive — an entity that people had more or less of, that could be used in an unidimensional way to describe people. College counselors sometimes warned students that they didn't have enough achievement motivation to make it through college; educators worried about how to increase the achievement motivation in children. The construct was used to help explain why Jews were mobile and Italian Catholics were not (Strodtbeck, 1958); to predict why certain Indian businessmen would succeed (McClelland and Winter, 1969); and, in our own work (Veroff and Feld, 1970) to understand why college-educated women devote themselves to child-rearing as an achievement goal. Those who did serious work on achievement motivation soon learned that one could not talk simply of the achievement motive. Distinctions grew. Atkinson (1957) was especially responsible for a distinction between a person's level of hope of success and his fear of failure. Atkinson's risk-taking model of achievement motivation grew out of this work and from it exciting empirical studies blossomed (Atkinson and Feather, 1966; Atkinson and Raynor, 1974). Horner (1974) introduced us to another idea -- fear of success. She proposed that the observed lack of competitive strivings in women might be explained by the interaction of fear of success with hope of success. Raynor (1974) introducted us to the conception of future orientation in people as an amplifier

CG009803

of their achievement motivation. He found that a person might act more or less achievement motivated in the present depending on whether his goals were oriented towards the here and now as opposed to the future. These insights about achievement motivation led us thus to differentiate types of achievement orientations along two parameters - the first parameter being the affective orientation to success (hopefulness, fearfulness not only of failure but of success), and the second parameter being one's time orientation to achievement.

Today, however, I do not want to talk about either the parameter of affective orientation to achievement or the parameter of time perspective.[1] Recently in looking at varieties of achievement motivation that may be critically different for men and women, I have been impressed by the different ways people cognitively define and experience a successful accomplishment. The differentations along this dimension can be seen as another parameter of achievement motivation, distinct from affective evaluations and from time perspectives. What may be one person's success may be another person's indifference not because of fears of failure or success, but because one person has learned to think of accomplishment very differently from another. I am thinking of some-

---

[1] These parameters open critical issues for educational research. In our educational environments how and when do we induce hope and fears about achievement? How do we induce different time perspectives about achievement? Many new researchers have alerted us to beginning answers to these questions. Some have shown us how sex role socialization in schools and colleges are critical ties to affective orientations to achievement (Burghardt, 1974, Alper, 1974; Douvan and Adelson, 1966; Horner, 1974; Stein and Bailey, 1973). Others have concentrated on how the attributions for success and failure happen differentially for males and females at different ages, attributions having powerful implications for the affective orientation to achievement (Dweck and Reppuci, 1973). Still others, Nuttin (1964), Raynor, Entin and Raynor (1972), Hubbard (1974), have examined what role future orientation towards achievement in educational settings plays in actual achievement strivings. Hubbard's work is particularly interesting for it points up how a future orientation in job training might even be detrimental for achievement strivings.

thing more subtle then saying "well, sure, some people get achievement joys out of scientific discovery while others get their joy from artistic expression" which may have to do with where each person's presumed talents are. The definition of success I am talking about has to do with what psychological cues the person has in his head to tell himself that he feels good to have done whatever he did or to do whatever he hopes to do. I have worked out a taxonomy of such cues people might use in defining their success. The handout describes that taxonomy. Let me explain that taxonomy, for in talking about sex differences in varieties of achievement orientations today I want to use its terminology. Let me preface my discussion of this taxonomy by saying that I think each type mentioned is a sub-variety of achievement motivation -- that is, each can meet the generic definition of achievement motivation given by McClelland and Atkinson: the desire for competing with standards of excellence.

The classification evolved out of answering two basic questions about what standards of excellence are, one listed on top of the columns and one to the left of the rows. Each is a psychological question that the scientist can ask about a person just completing an achievement activity: the first, in considering his accomplishment does the person emphasize the process of having achieved or the impact of his accomplishment? and the second, from where does the person derive his standard; in himself? in some social reference? or in an impersonal task demand? Let me expand each of these questions.

What do I mean:process vs. impact emphasis? In looking at something a person accomplished, he or she can consider how this achievement came about rather than the fact of what it is that actually got done. Consider the exhilaration of finishing a complicated puzzle. The sense of accomplishment is hardly the impact of the final depiction of the Mona Lisa in 500 interlocking pieces, but rather the sense that the person has persisted through arduous patient effort to accomplish it. Sure, the final solution was a

necessary condition for him to feel successful, but in his own terms the feelings of success came from an awareness of the process of accomplishment. I would thus call it a process emphasis. However, consider the insight into a mathematical solution. No matter how long a person has worked on it, the exhilaration comes from the moment of insight -- or the impact of solution, I would call that an impact emphasis.

What do I mean: From where does the person derive the standard of excellence for his achievement activity? For any sense of accomplishment the person has to see some part of himself as the origin of action. Indeed, much of DeCharms thinking and research (1968) and Weiner's (1974) recent reformulation of achievement motivation in attribution framework underscore this point. But I would like to ask a different question, about the perception of standard of evaluation. Some people see their own action as stimulated primarily by their own self standards and prefer an achievement setting where that is possible; others are very oriented to some social evaluation of achievement activity. The last source of evaluation of achievement strivings can be seen in some judgment of task accomplishment, some sense that there was a job to be mastered and how much and how well did it get mastered.

When these two questions of the taxonomy are answered simultaneously, first, whether there is a process vs. impact orientation to one's own achievment, and secondly, whether the person sees himself, others, or the task as the major force of low evaluation, we wind up with the varieties of achievement motivation listed in the handout. I would contend this taxonomy defines six varieties that we ought to be pursuing in research. A hypothesis I would entertain is that women more than men are oriented to the process rather than the impact types of achievement motivations. I will describe this taxonomy in more detail and try to present evidence available for the hypothesis about sex differences.

The first of the six varieties of achievement motivation I would like to discuss is Autonomous Achievement. With this kind of motivation the person is concerned about whether he was able to accomplish the activity by his own choice and by his own efforts in the process of achieving. This type of motivation is clearly process - oriented but is also clearly one that focuses entirely on the self as regulator of striving. Some research evidence does suggest that this variety of achievement may be more relevant for women in our society than men. Deci (1972) reports results of studying intrinsic motivation where men more than women are susceptible to changing their intrinsic interest in performing a task after social reinforcement. Women were initially pretty high on such performance when it was clear that no one was watching or attending to what was being done. Such results were parallel to what Langsam (1973) found. When he asked whether men or women sought more help with a difficult problem, there were no basic sex differences. But a man was less interested in autonomy than a woman when there was no peer there to watch him/her ask for help. His autonomy was clear only when a peer was judging him. In some recent work on different fantasy assessments of achievement motivation coded by the standard McClelland - Atkinson coding scheme, a student of mine has shown more women than men gave achievement themes to settings where they were struggling to do something without the aid of offered help of another person (Depner, 1975). In a large sample (Crandall, Katkovsky, and Crandall, 1965) report that adolescent girls score higher than adolescent boys in a measure of the internal control of their own achievement efforts, perhaps reflecting a stronger motivation for being in control of their efforts of achievement.

Now let us shift to the second variety listed in the taxonomy, one in which the emphasis for success is still in the self as evaluator of activity but the focus of concern shifts from the process of achievement to the impact of achieve-

ment felt by the self. I call that second variety Power Achievement. In this kind of motivation power and achievement are fused in the way that Adler originally theorized them to be, a kind of self assertive motivation through achievement. (Ansbacher, 1965) The best evidence I have that men more than women focus on their variety of achievement motivation comes from a study we did a few years ago which I will refer to as the Detroit Study. In that work we tried out many different measures of achievement motivation in a doorstep interview of representative sample of Detroit adults, as a way to assess the validity of different techniques for survey use. Factor analyses were performed on the many measures -- there were fantasy measures, objective questionnaire measures, behavioral measures of choice and persistence. The factor analyses yielded a number of common factors across all groups that enabled us to compare women and men on the absolute values of the factor scores as well as the correlation of factor scores with other information about the people. One of the factors we labeled Assertive Motivation. The measure with the highest loading on that factor was a scale that can be called a power achievement scale included such items as:

Which would you rather overhear about yourself:

(a) his opinion carried a lot of weight among the people who know him

(b) people like to live next door to him

(A) was coded for high in power.

Which would you rather overhear about yourself:

(a) he is fun to have at a party

(b) people like to go to him for advice on important matters

(B) was coded for high in power.

Another question was how high they would rate wanting to teach a child to be a leader. The factor of Assentive Motivation was much higher in males than females generally, although for both sexes it was a good predictor of achievement behaviors

(Veroff, McClelland, and Puhland, in press). Much of Winter's work on the power motive (1973) also picks up the essence of this kind of achievement motivation Winter, however, largely confines his study of this motive to males.

Now let us turn to the second row of the handout -- two types of socially oriented achievement motivation. This time success is clearly positively evaluated in the normative structure. The one with a process emphasis I call Responsibility Achievement Motivation and the other with an impact emphasis I call Competitive Achievement Motivation. In either one some sort of implicit social evaluation for good achievement is the essential force of the motivation. When we speak of responsibility achievement feelings we usually think of people who live by ethics of "trying hard," "working hard," "doing your best" as social definitions of the good person. Achievement gets to be a moral imperative. In some of these cases of achievement it is presumably not so much whether you win or lose but how you do it that counts. When I think of the good girl achievement syndrome often seen in the academic environment in the early grades and perhaps continuing throughout college, it is this type of motivation. Crandall and Battle (1970) have distinguished two types of successful academic women, one of whom is this rather responsible grade getting type who actually is a well integrated person with the regard to sex roles but somehow lacks that spark of creativity in achievement seen in the more intellectually - oriented women achievers. My guess is that achievement for these people, whether male or female, ultimately rests in what other people say is good achievement. Norms for doing one's best at assigned tasks become internalized incentives. My wife in her job of counseling college students describes the strong achievement motivation of many women to get good grades even when they know rationally their parents and friends don't care one way or the other any more.

The parallel orientation with an impact emphasis perhaps is best called a Competitive Achievement orientation -- doing best at an activity that the world defines as something to compare people on. This does seem like a kind of motivation easily and consistently engendered in males in our society. It is such an orientation in men which induces such remarkably high concern about failure at a deep level. We have found in the projective assessment of motivation in the Detroit survey that men have a much higher level of this deep fear than women (Veroff, McClelland, and Ruhland, in press). Furthermore it is such a competitive orientation that drives men to seek unrealistic high social comparison for their achievement. In many studies in children, (Veroff, 1969) and in adults (House, 1972, Veroff, McClelland, and Marquis, 1972) we have found that males more than females want to select a task to do that most people cannot do, while women are more oriented to seeking so-called realistic goals -- tasks that some people can do and some people cannot do. Although we found no significant differences between men and women in our Detroit survey in a measure of Social Comparison Achievement Motivation (the closest we came to a competitive motivation measure), only in men did the social comparison measure relate to the important other variable of educational attainment. The farther men came along in school the higher the social comparison orientation; this was not true for women.

Further evidence for this sex difference in socially evaluated achievement motivation comes in the work of Zander, Fuller, and Armstrong (1972) who found that women's reported pride or shame about themselves were affected much more by their team members efforts or lack of them, than were men's reported pride and shame. For males it was their competitive competence of their team members that really affected their pride and shame answers to the experimenter's questionnaire.

Finally let us turn to the last two types of achievement orientations listed on the handout -- one in which the person is aware of the task as being absorbing in its own right and as a result the task itself is the source of evaluation of achieve-

ment activity -- a kind of orientation to the task for its own sake. We again distinguish whether such a task orientation to achievement has a process emphasis or an impact emphasis. When it has a process emphasis let us call it Competence Achievement Motivation - a concern about whether the person can do that sort of task, what White specifically meant by competence. When a task orientation has an impact emphasis, lets call it Task Achievement Motivation, -- a concern about whether the person can accomplish that particular task. Over the years I have developed measures of how much interest a person has in repeating a task that he has failed, but one that he almost could do. I think it assesses this factor we are now labeling as competence: How much interest a person has in learning the skill of the demands of a particular task by repeating it to feel competent at it. This we would argue is a process emphasis. We were first puzzled by the fact that females have higher scores on this task (Veroff, 1969). These results were confirmed in our Detroit survey. What these results now tell us is that women are indeed more interested in building competence but not in having impact with their competence. The men on this measure prefer very difficult tasks, ones which if they could accomplish would indeed have impact. The male in other words is involved in an impact orientation to a task.

In our Detroit suvey we has a measure of task achievement motivation measure of effort and repetition of failure. The curious thing about the measure was that it was related to different things in men and women. In men it was related to their occupational status, indeed an impact variable, and in women it was related to an interesting measure of effort -- how much harder they worked when a more difficult task was presented to them following a moderately difficult task. This measure of effort we would take as a clear concern about task competence in learning how to adjust to the demands of a task, learning the process of competence and not the impact of competence per se. The implication of the idea would again be profound. If scientific discovery or artistic creation is

seen as task-oriented activity requiring careful learning of step-by-step activities than perhaps women rather than men would be more motivated to perform. If science or art demands a sudden shift in conceptualization or in styles, perhaps men more than women would be interested in that kind of activity. An unpublished insightful paper by Dorothy Kipnis (1973) first alerted me to this idea and many other ones in this paper.

In this very brief account of sex differences in varieties of achievement motivation, I'm sure to have overlooked many studies that perhaps threaten the major hypothesis that females in American-society have been taught to emphasize the process of their achievement of strivings and men the impact of their achievement strivings. I am sure there are results that contradict that, as there always are when such a complicated psychological factor as achievement motivation is examined for gross differences between the two sexes. To the extent the hypothesis is accurate I hope the differences diminish over the years as each sex learns to value the joys of achievement currently more characteristic of the other. Even if the sex difference hypothesis is not accurate this refined focus on varieties of achievement motivation could be productive of useful research for programs of education in the future.

REFERENCES

Alper, T. G. Achievement motivation in college women: A now-you-see-it now-you-don't phenomenon. American Psychologist, 1974, 29, 194-203.

Ansbacher, H. L. The structure of individual psychology. In B. B. Wolman (Ed.) Scientific Psychology. New York: Basic Books, 1965, 340-364.

Atkinson, J. W. Motivational determinants of risk-taking behavior. Psychology Review, 1957, 64, 359-372.

Atkinson, J. W., and Feather, N. T. (Eds.) A Theory of Achievement Motivation. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Atkinson, J. W., and Raynor, J. O. (Eds.) Motivation and Achievement. Washington D.C.: V. W. Winston & Sons, 1974.

Burghardt, N. R. Sex differences in the development of achievement-related motives, sex role identity and performance in competitive and non-competitive conditions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Crandall, V. C., and Battle, E. S. The antecedents and adult correlates of academic and intellectual effort. In J. P. Hill (Ed.) Minnesota Symposium in Child Psychology, 4, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1970.

DeCharms, R. Personal Causation. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Deci, E. C. Intrinsic motivation, extrinsic reinforcement, and inequity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 72, 113-120.

Depner, C. A multidimensional investigation of sex differences in achievement motivation. Unpublished paper, 1975.

Douvan, E. and Adelson, J. The adolescent experience. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Dweck, C. S. and Reppuci, N. D. Learned helplessness and reinforcement responsibility in children. Journal of Personality Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 109-116.

Horner, M. S. The measurement and behavioral implications of fear of success in women. In J. W. Atkinson and J. O. Raynor (Eds.) Motivation and Achievement, 1974, 91-117.

House, G. F. Orientations to achievement: autonomous, social comparison, and external. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1972.

Hubbard, R. Future achievement orientations, job training and economic sucess. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1974.

Kipnis, D. Sex roles, sex difference, incentives and anxiety -- who will achieve? Unpublished manuscript, 1973.

Langsam, I. The effect of sex and social setting in help-seeking behavior in a problem-solving situation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1973.

McClelland, D. C. and Winter, D. Motivating Economic Achievement. New York: The Free Press, 1969.

Nuttin, J. The Future time perspectives in human motivation and learning in Proceedings of the 17th international Congress of Psychology. Amsterdam: North Holland, 1964.

Raynor, J. O. Future Orientation in the study of achievement motivation, in Atkinson, J. W. and Raynor, J. O. (Eds.) Motivation and Achievement, Washington, D. C.: V. H. Winston, and Sons, 1974, 121-154.

Raynor, J. O., Entir, E. E. and Raynor, D. Effects of in Achievement. Test anxiety and length of contringent path on performance of grade school children. Unpublished paper, SUNY, at Buffalo, 1972.

Stein, A. H. and Bailey, M. N. The socialization of achievement orientation in females. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 345-366.

Strodtbeck, F. Family interaction, values, and achievement in D. C. McClelland (Ed.) Talent and Society. Princeton: Van-Nostrand, 1958, 135-194.

Veroff, J. Social comparison and the development of achievement motivation. in C. P. Smith (Ed.) Achievment related motives in children. New York: Russell Sage, 1969.

Veroff, and Feld, S. C. Marriage and Work in America. New York: Van Nostrand, Reinhold, 1970.

Veroff, J. McClelland, L., and Marquis, K. Measuring intellectual and achievement motivation in surveys. Final report to OEO, contract No. OEO-4180, 1972.

Veroff, J.; McClelland, L.; and Ruhland, D. Varieties of achievement motivation In M. Mednick, S. Tangri, S. and L. Hoffman, (Eds.) Women: Social Psychological Perspectives on Achievement. New York: Holt, in press.

Weiner, B. Achievement Motivation and Attribution Theory, Morriston: General Learning Press, 1974.

Winter, D. The Power Motive. New York: Free Press, 1973.

Zander, A., Fuller, R., and Armstrong W. Attributed pride or shame in group and self. Journal Personality and Social Psychology, 23, 1972, 346-352.

Varieties of Achievement Motivation
(With the Cognitive Inquiries Each Implies to Define Standards of Excellence for Successful Accomplishment)

		IN CONSIDERING ACCOMPLISHMENT DOES THE PERSON EVALUATE THE PROCESS OR THE IMPACT?	
		Process Emphasis	Impact Emphasis
FROM WHERE DOES THE PERSON DERIVE THE STANDARD OF EXCELLENCE?	Self	AUTONOMOUS ACHIEVEMENT (Did I do it alone and by my choice?)	POWER ACHIEVEMENT (Did I have an impact?)
	Social Reference	RESPONSIBILITY ACHIEVEMENT (Did I try as hard as I was supposed to?)	COMPETITIVE ACHIEVEMENT (Did I do it as good as the others, better than, or the best?)
	Impersonal Task	COMPETENCE ACHIEVEMENT (Did I do that sort of thing?)	TASK ACHIEVEMENT (Did that problem get solved?)